arXiv:1605.05113v2 [hep-ph] 19 Sep 2016

Remarks on the P_c structures and triangle singularities

Feng-Kun Guo[1,*], Ulf-G. Meißner[2,3,†], Juan Nieves[4‡] and Zhi Yang[2,§]

[1] *Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100190, China*

[2] *Helmholtz-Institut für Strahlen- und Kernphysik and Bethe Center for Theoretical Physics, Universität Bonn, D-53115 Bonn, Germany*

[3] *Institute for Advanced Simulation, Institut für Kernphysik and Jülich Center for Hadron Physics, Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich, Germany*

[4] *Instituto de Física Corpuscular (IFIC), Centro Mixto CSIC-Universidad de Valencia, Institutos de Investigación de Paterna, Aptd. 22085, E-46071 Valencia, Spain*

September 20, 2016

Abstract

It was proposed that the narrow $P_c(4450)$ structure observed by the LHCb Collaboration in the reaction $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi p K$ might be due to a triangle singularity around the χ_{c1}–proton threshold at 4.45 GeV. We discuss the occurrence of a similar triangle singularity in the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution for the decay $\Lambda_b \to J/\psi p \pi$, which could explain the bump around 4.45 GeV in the data. More precise measurements of this process would provide valuable information towards an understanding of the P_c structures.

*Email address: fkguo@itp.ac.cn
†Email address: meissner@hiskp.uni-bonn.de
‡Email address: jmnieves@ific.uv.es
§Email address: zhiyang@hiskp.uni-bonn.de

In 2015, the LHCb Collaboration reported the observation of two resonant-like structures in the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution in the decay process $\Lambda_b \to K^- J/\psi p$ [1]. Fitting with Breit–Wigner forms, the masses and widths of these structures are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{P_c(4380)} &= (4380 \pm 8 \pm 29)\ \text{MeV}, & \Gamma_{P_c(4380)} &= (205 \pm 18 \pm 86)\ \text{MeV}, \\ M_{P_c(4450)} &= (4449.8 \pm 1.7 \pm 2.5)\ \text{MeV}, & \Gamma_{P_c(4450)} &= (39 \pm 5 \pm 19)\ \text{MeV}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Note that the signal for the narrow $P_c(4550)$ is very clear, whereas the necessity for including the broad $P_c(4380)$ may require some scrutiny (see also the discussion in Ref. [2]). If these structures are genuine resonance states, being in the mass region with a pair of charm and anti-charm quarks, they would contain five valence quarks. Further, the LHCb Collaboration recently reported a refined model-independent analysis in Ref. [3] which shows that the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution cannot be described without introducing additional contribution due to exotic hadrons, such as the P_c, or rescattering effects, such as the triangle singularities to be discussed here. After the discovery, they have been suggested to be meson-baryon hadronic molecules (predictions of such meson-baryon states [4–7] have been made a few years before the LHCb discovery) or compact pentaquarks by a number of groups [8–25] (see Refs. [26, 27] for partial reviews).

However, not all peaks in invariant mass distributions are due to resonances, which are poles of the S-matrix. The S-matrix also possesses other types of singularities, such as the branch points (and the associated cuts) at two-body thresholds, and also the so-called triangle singularity originating from a triangle diagram. Poles of the S-matrix are of dynamical origin in the sense that they exist because the interaction among the internal constituents is strong enough such that poles are generated in the scattering amplitude. This is necessarily a non-perturbative phenomenon. In contrast, singularities like branch points and triangle singularities are of kinematical origin. They emerge in the physical amplitude and can produce observable effects when the kinematics of a process is special. For detailed discussions about the triangle singularity, we refer to the 1960ties monographs [28, 29], recent lecture notes by one of the key players in the old days [30] and the book [31]. For instance, considering a triangle diagram, if the involved masses and momenta are such that all of the three intermediate particles can go on shell with all of the interaction vertices satisfying energy-momentum conservation [32], then the triangle singularity is on the physical boundary and can show up as a peak in the corresponding invariant mass distribution. To be



Figure 1: A triangle diagram. Here, each internal line is labelled by the mass of the corresponding particle and each external line by its four-momentum.

more explicit, let us take Fig. 1 and explain the kinematical region where the triangle singularity can occur. The diagram can be interpreted as particle p_{12} decays into particles m_1 and m_2, following by the sequential decay of m_1 into p_{13} and m_3, and m_2 and m_3 react to generate the external p_{23}. We may consider the rest frame of p_{12}. The triangle singularity is on the physical boundary when all of the intermediates states $m_{1,2,3}$ are on their mass shell, and moreover, particle m_3 moves along the same direction and with a larger speed than particle m_2. In this kinematical region, particle m_3 can catch up with particle m_2 to rescatter like a classical process.

In the last few years, triangle singularities have been used to explain various structures in invariant mass distributions of two or three hadrons [33–39]. Triangle singularities present another possibility of explaining the LHCb P_c structures. In particular, the narrower structure $P_c(4450)$ coincides with the $\chi_{c1}\, p$ threshold which is also the position of the triangle singularity of the

loop diagram with $\Lambda^*(1890)\,\chi_{c1}\,p$ intermediate states [40,41]. If the P_c structures are really due to triangle singularities, the LHCb discovery will still be very important because triangle singularities are one of the intriguing analytic properties of the S-matrix, and their observability has been discussed since long time ago (see Ref. [42] for a classics, and Ref. [43] for a recent discussion).

Being the first candidates of explicitly exotic pentaquark states[1], either as hadronic molecules or compact pentaquarks, one of the utmost important issues regarding the observed P_c structures is to distinguish the kinematic singularity explanation from resonances. Because the triangle singularity depends on the kinematics very strongly, one should search for the P_c structures in processes with a different kinematics where the triangle singularities discussed in Refs. [40, 41] do not play a role. For this purpose, suggested experiments include searching for the P_c structures in the $\chi_{c1}p$ invariant mass distribution of the decay $\Lambda_b \to K^- \chi_{c1} p$ which is expected to have a similar branching fraction as that of the $\Lambda_b \to K^- J/\psi p$ [40], and searching for the structures in reactions with a different kinematics such as the photoproduction processes [44–47], pion induced reactions [48, 49] and heavy ion collisions [50, 51]. From this point of view, investigating whether other processes with a $J/\psi p$ in the final state have similar triangle singularities is important and necessary. One of such processes which is closely related to the observation process of the P_c structures is the reaction $\Lambda_b \to \pi^- J/\psi p$, the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution of which has in fact been measured by the LHCb Collaboration [52]. This process was studied in Refs. [53] in the context of hidden-charm pentaquarks, and it is noted that there is indeed a nontrivial structure around 4.45 GeV.

Here we will discuss further the model proposed in Ref. [40] which observes that the narrow $P_c(4450)$ might be due to kinematic singularities related to the $\chi_{c1}p$ normal and abnormal thresholds. In Ref. [40], it is noticed that the narrow $P_c(4450)$ is located exactly at the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold, $M_{P_c(4450)} - M_{\chi_{c1}} - M_p = (0.9 \pm 3.1)$ MeV, and when the measured decay $\Lambda_b \to K^- J/\psi p$ occurs through the $\Lambda^*(1890)\chi_{c1}p$ triangle diagram, where the Λ_b decays into the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ and χ_{c1} first and the proton as a decay product of the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ rescatters with the χ_{c1} into the $J/\psi p$, the triangle singularity (abnormal threshold) is also located at the same place. To be more precise, it is slightly moved into the complex energy plane because the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ can decay into $K^- p$ and thus has a finite width. We will show that there can also be triangle singularities around 4.45 GeV in the three-body decay $\Lambda_b \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ as well, which are able to reproduce the nontrivial $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution in that region.

For a given triangle diagram, the locations of the triangle singularities, also called leading Landau singularities, are given by solving the quadratic equation [54]

$$1 + 2\,y_{12}\,y_{23}\,y_{13} = y_{12}^2 + y_{23}^2 + y_{13}^2, \tag{2}$$

with $y_{ij} = (m_i^2 + m_j^2 - p_{ij}^2)/(2\,m_i\,m_j)$. The definitions of the momenta and masses can be read off from Fig. 1. The singularities need to be understood with the help of the analytic properties of the S-matrix. For instance, let us consider the diagram shown in Fig. 1, and consider the case measuring the $s_{23} \equiv p_{23}^2$ invariant mass distribution. The threshold of m_2 and m_3 leads to a branch point. The cut from this branch point divides the complex s_{23} plane into two Riemann sheets, and the upper boundary of the cut in the first Riemann sheet presents the physical region of the process $m_2 + m_3 \to p_{23}$, where p_{23} can be regarded as the total momentum of the particles emitted from the scattering between m_2 and m_3. It turns out that one of the solutions of the quadratic equation in Eq. (2) is always far from the physical region, and the the other one could be close to the physical region (and also close to the threshold of m_2 and m_3). This happens when it is located in the lower half plane of the second Riemann sheet, below the cut, with a small imaginary part (for a more detailed discussion for the case of the $P_c(4550)$, see Ref. [40]). The condition is that all of the three intermediate particles are on their mass shells, and the rescattering between

[1] In fact, the quantum numbers of the P_c structures can be formed by three light quarks, and thus are non-exotic. However, since they are located above 4 GeV, if they are light baryons the vast amount of phase space would allow them to decay into light hadrons very fast and the widths would be much larger than those reported by the LHCb Collaboration. Therefore, it is more natural to assume that there are a pair of charm and anticharm quarks inside the annihilation of which into light hadrons are suppressed.

m_2 and m_3 can happen as a classical process [32]. It is fulfilled when m_1 is inside or at least in the vicinity of the range $m_1 \in [m_{1,\text{low}}, m_{1,\text{high}}]$ with [40, 43]

$$m_{1,\text{low}} = \sqrt{\frac{p_{12}^2 m_3 + p_{13}^2 m_2}{m_2 + m_3} - m_2 m_3} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{1,\text{high}} = \sqrt{p_{12}^2} - m_2 \,. \tag{3}$$

Substituting this range of m_1 into Eq. (2), and noticing that only one of the solutions is possible to be near the physical region (see discussions in, e.g., Refs. [40, 42, 55]), the triangle singularity in the variable p_{23}^2 lies in the corresponding range

$$p_{23,\,\text{sing.}}^2 \in \left[(m_2 + m_3)^2, m_2^2 + m_3^2 - 2m_2 m_3 y_{23}\right] . \tag{4}$$

The upper bound can also be written as $m_2^2 + m_3^2 + 2m_2 m_3 y_{13}$ by using that $y_{12} = -1$ and $y_{23} + y_{13} = 0$, which are valid only for $m_1 = m_{1,\text{high}}$. One notices that if the resonance m_1 takes a mass of $m_{1,\text{low}}$, the amplitude will be singular at $p_{23}^2 = (m_2 + m_3)^2$. Of course, a physical amplitude never diverges in the physical region. In this case, the fact that all the intermediate particles can go on shell means that the particle m_1 can decay into particles m_3 and p_{13}, and thus it must be an unstable resonance. As a consequence, the triangle singularity cannot reside on the real p_{23}^2 axis, but in the complex plane so that the relevant amplitude in the physical region still takes a finite value. Nevertheless, if the singularity is not located deep in the complex plane, it will then introduce a visible peak around the real part of the singularity location in the p_{23}^2 distribution. In addition, for a value of m_1 slightly beyond the range given in Eq. (3), the singularity is not far from the physical boundary and could still cause a visible effect.

Since the peak position of the $P_c(4450)$ coincides with the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold, we consider the case with m_2 and m_3 being the χ_{c1} and proton, respectively. The triangle diagram suggested in Ref. [40] for the process $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ is shown in Fig. 2 (a), with the mass of the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ exactly at the lower edge of the range $[1.89, 2.11]$ GeV given by Eq. (3). Replacing the Λ^* by an



Figure 2: Triangle diagrams which can produce a peak around 4.45 GeV in the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution for the processes (a) $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ and (b) $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$.

N^* resonance, we get the analogue for the process $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$. The relevant mass range of the N^* is $[1.84, 2.11]$ GeV. Within this range, there are two three-star nucleon resonances: the $N^*(1875)$ with $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^-$ and the $N^*(1900)$ with $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$. Substituting $(1.875 - i\,0.125)$ GeV and $(1.9 - i\,0.1)$ GeV as their masses [2] in Eq. (2), we find triangle singularities at

$$(4429 - i\,10)\ \text{MeV} \quad \text{and} \quad (4439 - i\,16)\ \text{MeV} \,, \tag{5}$$

respectively. Because the singularity is in the second Riemann sheet of the complex $m_{J/\psi p}$ plane, the absolute value of amplitude with the singularities as given in Eq. (5), as well as that for the $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$, is maximized at the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold. This is because the real parts of the singularity positions are smaller than the branch point, the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold. It is thus similar to the case that an amplitude that possesses a virtual state pole has a sharp cusp at the relevant threshold. However, since the imaginary parts of the values given above is larger than that for the

[2] Here, the values refer to $M - i\,\Gamma/2$, and we use the central values of the masses and widths as given by the PDG [56].

one induced by the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ for the process $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$, $(4447.8 - i\,0.3)$ MeV, the peak due to the triangle singularities through the exchange of the N^* as shown in Fig. 2 (b) should have a larger width than that for Fig. 2 (a).

Here, we do not intend to construct a full model for the three-body decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$, which is a formidable task if all the final state interactions including the exchange of N^* resonances, and even the exotic $Z_c(3900)$, and kinematical singularities are taken into account. Instead, we only want to illustrate that the bump around 4.45 GeV in its $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution observed by the LHCb collaboration may be due to the triangle singularities discussed above. Since we do not know the relative strength for the decays $\Lambda_b \to N^*(1875)\chi_{c1}$ and $\Lambda_b \to N^*(1900)\chi_{c1}$, we choose to include only the $N^*(1900)$ which has the same spin and parity as the $\Lambda^*(1890)$. We also include as an additional contribution the tree-level exchanges of the $N^*(1440)$, the $N^*(1520)$ and the $N^*(1650)$ with the masses and widths taken from Ref. [56]. The N^* exchanges can describe well the $p\pi$ invariant mass distribution, and provide a smooth background to the $J/\psi p$ one. It is its interference with the triangle singularity that produces the observed peak around 4.4 GeV in our fit as shown in Fig. 3.



Figure 3: Comparison of a model including the triangle singularities from Fig. 2 (b) with the experimental data. Tree-level exchanges of the $N^*(1440)$, the $N^*(1520)$ and the $N^*(1650)$, as depicted in Fig. 4, are included to describe the $p\pi$ invariant mass distribution. The data are taken from Ref. [52]. The solid lines and binned histograms show the fit to the data in the range $M_{J/\psi p} \in [4.33, 4.58]$ GeV and $M_{p\pi} \in [1.33, 1.85]$ GeV, the dotted line shows the contribution from the tree-level exchange of the N^* resonances and the dashed line show the contribution from triangle diagram.



Figure 4: Diagrams in the simple model used to fit to the LHCb data.



Figure 5: Comparison of the scalar three-point loop function for the $N^*(1900)$ with a complex mass $(1.9 - i\,0.1)$ GeV (solid curve) with that convoluted with the spectral function as given in Eq. (6) (dashed curve).

In the fit, we have used a complex mass, $M - i\,\Gamma/2$, to take the width effect of $N^*(1900)$ into account. Although this is not the rigorous way to deal with the width effect, such a method has been shown to be able to correctly account for the peak effects in Ref. [55]. In order to check that statement, we compare the absolute value of the scalar triangle loop function, denoted as $C_0(m^2_{N^*})$, for the $N^*(1900)$ with a complex mass $m_{N^*} = (1.9 - i\,0.1)$ GeV with that with a variable mass convoluted with a spectral function as follows:

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\int_{s_a}^{s_b} ds\,\mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{-1}{s - m^2 + i\,m\,\Gamma}\right) C_0(s)\,, \tag{6}$$

with $m = 1.9$ GeV and $\Gamma = 0.2$ GeV where the integration region is taken to be between $s_a = (m - 2\,\Gamma)^2$ and $s_b = (m + 2\,\Gamma)^2$. The comparison is shown in Fig. 5 by the solid and dashed curves showing the results with a complex mass and with a spectral function as given above, respectively. One sees that indeed the peaks in both cases are quite similar to each other.

Because the $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ decay is Cabibbo-suppressed in comparison with the $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ decay, the observed number of events is smaller, and as a result, the bin width of the reported data of the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution is 50 MeV in Ref. [52], while it is 15 MeV in Ref. [1] where the P_c structures were observed. If the $P_c(4450)$ is really due to triangle singularities, one would expect that it behaves differently in different reactions as different intermediate states are involved. One sees that the dashed line in the left panel of Fig. 3 is broader than the peak around 4.45 GeV in Fig. 6. On the contrary, if the $P_c(4450)$ is due to a real resonance, one would expect it to have the same width in the same final states $J/\psi\pi$ for both decays of $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ and $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$. However, with a 50 MeV bin width, one cannot distinguish between these two scenarios. It is thus important to measure the $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ more precisely to distinguish the triangle singularity from the resonance scenario.

We want to emphasize here that the mechanism in this model should not be regarded as a complete model for the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$. Its sole purpose is to show that the peaks as observed are compatible with those produced by triangle singularities. Therefore, the confirmation of the P_c structures in other processes with very different kinematics which are expected to be free of the singularities discussed here, is urgently called for.

There could be even more triangle singularities. For instance, replacing the χ_{c1} by the $X(3872)$ and replacing the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ by a Λ^* with a mass in the range from 1.65 GeV to 1.75 GeV, like e.g. the four-star $J^P = 3/2^-$ resonance $\Lambda^*(1690)$, one would be able to get a triangle singularity close to the threshold of the $X(3872)$ and proton at about 4.81 GeV. A comparison of the locations of the triangle singularity discussed in Ref. [40] and that due to the singularity of the $\Lambda^*(1690)$–

$X(3872)$–p triangle diagram with the LHCb data of the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution for the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ is presented in Fig. 6, where the solid lines with sharp peaks are given by the absolute value of the corresponding triangle diagram. We remark that the purpose here is only to compare the locations of the triangle singularities in the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution with the data.



Figure 6: Comparing the locations of two triangle singularities close to the $\chi_{c1}p$ and $X(3872)p$ thresholds, respectively, with the LHCb data of the $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution for the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$.

For a quantitative understanding of the contribution of the triangle singularities discussed here and in Ref. [40], the couplings for all the three vertices need to be known. While the pionic (kaonic) decays from the N^* (Λ^*) to the nucleon can be obtained from the corresponding partial decay widths of the N^* (Λ^*), the weak decays of the Λ_b into the χ_{c1} and N^* (Λ^*) need to be measured. In addition, lattice QCD calculations are also necessary for obtaining reliable information on the rescattering $\chi_{c1}p \to J/\psi p$. Because there is no common valence quark between a charmonium and a nucleon, the rescattering process $\chi_{c1}p \to J/\psi p$ is not expected to be very strong.[3] However, we notice that a recent lattice QCD calculation by the NPLQCD Collaboration reveals possible existence of charmonium-nucleus bound states [58]. Note that the lattice calculation was performed at a pion mass as heavy as 805 MeV. A leading order chiral extrapolation to the physical quark masses results in a charmonium-nucleus binding energy of $\lesssim 40$ MeV [58].

To summarize, we have shown that there could be a triangle singularity around the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold in the measured $J/\psi p$ invariant mass distribution for the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$. It originates from a triangle diagram with the χ_{c1}, proton and a narrow N^* resonance, in the mass range of $[1.84, 2.11]$ GeV, as intermediate states. It is similar to the model explaining the $P_c(4450)$ in the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ proposed in Ref. [40], where the $\Lambda^*(1890)$ takes the place of the N^*. More precise measurements of the $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ will be extremely helpful to study the P_c structures.

Note added: After the submission of this manuscript to the journal, LHCb reported on a new measurement on the $\Lambda_b^0 \to \pi^- J/\psi p$ [59]. The P_c structures are not as significant as those in the $\Lambda_b^0 \to K^- J/\psi p$ [1]. Yet, it was claimed that consistent production rates in both processes were obtained.

[3] It is worthwhile to notice that such a meson–baryon interaction scales as $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c)$ in the large N_c limit [57], not as much suppressed as the analogous OZI–forbidden meson–meson scattering which scales as $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c^2)$.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Eulogio Oset for helpful discussions. FKG gratefully acknowledges the hospitality at the HISKP where part of this work was performed. UGM and ZY acknowledge the hospitality of the ITP/CAS, where part of this work was done. This work is supported in part by DFG and NSFC through funds provided to the Sino-German CRC 110 "Symmetries and the Emergence of Structure in QCD" (NSFC Grant No. 11621131001), by the Thousand Talents Plan for Young Professionals, by the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) (Grant No. QYZDB-SSW-SYS013), by the CAS President's International Fellowship Initiative (PIFI) (Grant No. 2015VMA076), by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and European FEDER funds under the contracts FIS2014-51948-C2-1-P, FIS2014-57026-REDT and SEV-2014-0398 and by Generalitat Valenciana under contract PROMETEOII/2014/0068.

References

[1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 072001 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03414 [hep-ex]].

[2] L. Roca and E. Oset, arXiv:1602.06791 [hep-ph].

[3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 082002 (2016) [arXiv:1604.05708 [hep-ex]].

[4] J. J. Wu, R. Molina, E. Oset and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 232001 (2010) [arXiv:1007.0573 [nucl-th]].

[5] J. J. Wu, R. Molina, E. Oset and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 015202 (2011) [arXiv:1011.2399 [nucl-th]].

[6] Z. C. Yang, Z. F. Sun, J. He, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Chin. Phys. C **36**, 6 (2012) [arXiv:1105.2901 [hep-ph]].

[7] C. W. Xiao, J. Nieves and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 056012 (2013) [arXiv:1304.5368 [hep-ph]].

[8] R. Chen, X. Liu, X. Q. Li and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 132002 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03704 [hep-ph]].

[9] H. X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, T. G. Steele and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 172001 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03717 [hep-ph]].

[10] L. Roca, J. Nieves and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 094003 (2015) [arXiv:1507.04249 [hep-ph]].

[11] A. Mironov and A. Morozov, JETP Lett. **102**, 271 (2015) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **102**, 302 (2015)] [arXiv:1507.04694 [hep-ph]].

[12] L. Maiani, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Lett. B **749**, 289 (2015) [arXiv:1507.04980 [hep-ph]].

[13] J. He, Phys. Lett. B **753**, 547 (2016) [arXiv:1507.05200 [hep-ph]].

[14] R. F. Lebed, Phys. Lett. B **749**, 454 (2015) [arXiv:1507.05867 [hep-ph]].

[15] U.-G. Meißner and J. A. Oller, Phys. Lett. B **751**, 59 (2015) [arXiv:1507.07478 [hep-ph]].

[16] G. N. Li, X. G. He and M. He, JHEP **1512**, 128 (2015) [arXiv:1507.08252 [hep-ph]].

[17] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 70 (2016) [arXiv:1508.01468 [hep-ph]].

[18] N. N. Scoccola, D. O. Riska and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 051501 (2015) [arXiv:1508.01172 [hep-ph]].

[19] V. V. Anisovich, M. A. Matveev, J. Nyiri, A. V. Sarantsev and A. N. Semenova, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, 1550190 (2015) [arXiv:1509.04898 [hep-ph]].

[20] G. J. Wang, L. Ma, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 034031 (2016) [arXiv:1511.04845 [hep-ph]].

[21] G. Yang and J. Ping, arXiv:1511.09053 [hep-ph].

[22] Q. F. Lü and Y. B. Dong, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 074020 (2016) [arXiv:1603.00559 [hep-ph]].

[23] Y. Shimizu, D. Suenaga and M. Harada, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 114003 (2016) [arXiv:1603.02376 [hep-ph]].

[24] C. W. Shen, F. K. Guo, J. J. Xie and B. S. Zou, Nucl. Phys. A **954**, 393 (2016) [arXiv:1603.04672 [hep-ph]].

[25] E. Santopinto and A. Giachino, arXiv:1604.03769 [hep-ph].

[26] T. J. Burns, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 152 (2015) [arXiv:1509.02460 [hep-ph]].

[27] H. X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rept. **639**, 1 (2016) [arXiv:1601.02092 [hep-ph]].

[28] R. J. Eden, P. V. Landshoff, D. I. Olive and J. C. Polkinghorne, *The Analytic S-Matrix*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1966.

[29] T. S. Chang, *Introduction to Dispersion Relation* (2 volumes, in Chinese, written in 1965), Science Press, Beijing, 1980.

[30] I. J. R. Aitchison, arXiv:1507.02697 [hep-ph].

[31] A. V. Anisovich, V. V. Anisovich, M. A. Matveev, V. A. Nikonov, J. Nyiri and Sarantsev. A.V., "Three-particle physics and dispersion relation theory," World Scientific, Singapore, 2013.

[32] S. Coleman and R. E. Norton, Nuovo Cim. **38**, 438 (1965).

[33] J. J. Wu, X. H. Liu, Q. Zhao and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 081803 (2012) [arXiv:1108.3772 [hep-ph]].

[34] X. G. Wu, J. J. Wu, Q. Zhao and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 014023 (2013) [arXiv:1211.2148 [hep-ph]].

[35] Q. Wang, C. Hanhart and Q. Zhao, Phys. Lett. B **725**, 106 (2013) [arXiv:1305.1997 [hep-ph]].

[36] M. Mikhasenko, B. Ketzer and A. Sarantsev, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 094015 (2015) [arXiv:1501.07023 [hep-ph]].

[37] N. N. Achasov, A. A. Kozhevnikov and G. N. Shestakov, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 036003 (2015) [arXiv:1504.02844 [hep-ph]].

[38] I. T. Lorenz, H.-W. Hammer and U.-G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 034018 (2015) [arXiv:1506.02282 [hep-ph]].

[39] A. P. Szczepaniak, Phys. Lett. B **747**, 410 (2015) [arXiv:1501.01691 [hep-ph]].

[40] F.-K. Guo, U.-G. Meißner, W. Wang and Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 071502 (2015) [arXiv:1507.04950 [hep-ph]].

[41] X. H. Liu, Q. Wang and Q. Zhao, Phys. Lett. B **757**, 231 (2016) [arXiv:1507.05359 [hep-ph]].

[42] C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. **154**, 1363 (1967).

[43] X. H. Liu, M. Oka and Q. Zhao, Phys. Lett. B **753**, 297 (2016) [arXiv:1507.01674 [hep-ph]].

[44] Q. Wang, X. H. Liu and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 034022 (2015) [arXiv:1508.00339 [hep-ph]].

[45] V. Kubarovsky and M. B. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 031502 (2015) [arXiv:1508.00888 [hep-ph]].

[46] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **752**, 329 (2016) [arXiv:1508.01496 [hep-ph]].

[47] Y. Huang, J. J. Xie, J. He, X. Chen and H. F. Zhang, arXiv:1604.05969 [nucl-th].

[48] Q. F. Lü, X. Y. Wang, J. J. Xie, X. R. Chen and Y. B. Dong, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 034009 (2016) [arXiv:1510.06271 [hep-ph]].

[49] X. H. Liu and M. Oka, Nucl. Phys. A **954**, 352 (2016) [arXiv:1602.07069 [hep-ph]].

[50] R. Q. Wang, J. Song, K. J. Sun, L. W. Chen, G. Li and F. L. Shao, arXiv:1601.02835 [hep-ph].

[51] I. Schmidt and M. Siddikov, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 094005 (2016) [arXiv:1601.05621 [hep-ph]].

[52] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], JHEP **1407**, 103 (2014) [arXiv:1406.0755 [hep-ex]].

[53] E. Wang, H. X. Chen, L. S. Geng, D. M. Li and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 094001 (2016) [arXiv:1512.01959 [hep-ph]].

[54] L. D. Landau, Nucl. Phys. **13**, 181 (1959).

[55] I. J. R. Aitchison, Phys. Rev. **133**, B1257 (1964).

[56] K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014).

[57] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **160**, 57 (1979).

[58] S. R. Beane, E. Chang, S. D. Cohen, W. Detmold, H.-W. Lin, K. Orginos, A. Parreo and M. J. Savage, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 114503 (2015) [arXiv:1410.7069 [hep-lat]].

[59] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 082003 (2016) [arXiv:1606.06999 [hep-ex]].